UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO. Dox 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/403,224	10/15/1999	KOJI MATSUMOTO	0020-4621P	6995	
75	90 08/13/2003				
BIRCH STEV	VART KOLASCH & B	EXAMI	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 220400747			WILSON, DONALD R		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1713	17	
			DATE MAILED: 08/13/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

75.		Application	ı No.	Applicant(s)	~				
		09/403,224		MATSUMOTO ET	AL				
Office Action Summary		Examin r		Art Unit					
		Donald R W		1713					
Period fo	Th MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the	cover shet with the c	orrespondence ac	ldr ss				
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu - Any (ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no even y within the statute will apply and will , cause the applic	t, however, may a reply be time ory minimum of thirty (30) days expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the ation to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered time the mailing date of this co	y ommunication.				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 J	June 2003 .							
2a)⊠		is action is n	on-final.						
3)									
Dispositi	on of Claims								
4)🖂	Claim(s) 9-12 is/are pending in the application	۱.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) 11 and 12 is/are with	drawn from	consideration.						
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.				,				
6)⊠	Claim(s) 9 and 10 is/are rejected.								
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election red	juirement.						
Applicati	on Papers								
9) 🗌	The specification is objected to by the Examiner	r.							
10) 🔲 -	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)□ accep	oted or b)□ o	bjected to by the Exan	niner.					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) b	e held in abeyance. Se	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
11) 🔲 -	The proposed drawing correction filed on	₋ is: a)□ app	roved b)⊡ disappro	ved by the Examin	er.				
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep	•	e action.						
12) 🗌 🗆	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer.							
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			•					
13)⊠	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority unde	er 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).					
a)[☑ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:								
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been	received.						
	Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been	received in Applicatio	on No	÷				
	 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 								
	cknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic		•		application).				
a)	The translation of the foreign language province.	visional appl	ication has been rece	eived.	,				
ر اسارہ Attachment		o priority unit	c. 55 5.5.5. 33 120	anaroi (2).					
1) Notice 2) Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5	Notice of Informal Page	(PTO-413) Paper No(atent Application (PT0					

Art Unit: 1713

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment filed 6/30/03, has been fully considered with the following results.

Previously Cited Statutes

- 2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office Action.
- 3. Applicant's continued traversal of the restriction requirement is not deemed to be persuasive and the finality of the restriction requirement is maintained. Applicant makes the conclusory statement that the subject matter is sufficiently connected such that there would be no burden on the Examiner to examine all of the claims. As set forth in the previous Office Action, it does not follow that product claims would be allowable if the process of making them is found to be allowable as has been alleged by applicant. Product claims made by any process which could lead to an equivalent product would need to be searched, which involves additional searching and concepts. Further, the entire prosecution of the application needs to be considered, not just the search.
- 4. Applicant's traversal of the prior art rejections is also not deemed to be persuasive and the rejections are maintained for reasons discussed below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102(b) - 35 USC § 103

- 5. Claim 9 is under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over WO'995, Tatemoto, or Albano. The basis of this rejection was stated in Detailed Action § 6-10 of the previous Office Action.
- 6. Applicant's argument that none of the references "--- disclose or suggest a primary <u>and</u> <u>secondary curing step</u> at the specific conditions of the claimed invention" (underlining added) is interesting as the instant claims recite "wherein no secondary curing is performed". Hence the argument cannot be sustained. The argument that the cited references exemplify the peroxides used in the present invention as equal to 2,5-dimethyl-2,5-di(tert-butylperoxy)hexane and fails to distinguish the peroxides used in the present invention from other peroxides is not deemed to be persuasive because they are at least distinguished by their specific teaching among a very limited number of peroxides. Thus, one of

Art Unit: 1713

ordinary skill in the art would have readily envisaged using the same peroxides as used in the instantly claimed invention. The argument that there is no teaching that the cured products of the cited invention would have the same properties as those of the present invention is not deemed to be persuasive for reasons set forth in Detailed Action § of the previous Office Action.

- 7. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Tatemoto. The basis of this rejection was stated in Detailed Action § 11-12 of the previous Office Action.
- 8. Applicant relies upon the same arguments used in the rejection of Claim 9 above which is not deemed to be persuasive for the same reasons stated above.
- 9. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO'995, Tatemoto, or Albano, as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Admissions by Applicant. The basis of this rejection was stated in Detailed Action § 13-14 of the previous Office Action.
- 10. Applicant again relies upon the same arguments used in the rejection of Claim 9 above which is not deemed to be persuasive for the same reasons stated above.

Action Is Final

- 11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
- 12. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.
- 13. This application contains Claims 11-12 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in Paper No. 15. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancelation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Future Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Donald R Wilson whose telephone number is 703-308-2398.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on 703-308-2450. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this

Art Unit: 1713

application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications. The unofficial direct fax phone number to the Examiner's desk is 703-872-9029.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 308-2351.

> Donald R Wilson **Primary Examiner**

Art Unit 1713